

2. The Collapse of a Theory

MAN PERCEIVED THAT HIS FORBEARS WERE HOMINID APES. HE TRIES TO EXPLAIN HIS FORMATION ON THE BASIS OF THE THEORY OF NATURAL EVOLUTION. BUT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IS IN CONTRADICTION TO COSMIC ORDER. IT WAS SET IN MOTION BY MAN'S OWN SINFUL INTERFERENCE AND PRODUCED PHYSICAL DEFECTS DANGEROUS TO HIS EXISTENCE AND AN OVER-SIZED SICK BRAIN, WHICH MADE HIS SELF-DESTRUCTION APPEAR TO BE PROGRESS.

Proof that man is descended from the ape or—as man prefers to put it—from an ape-like creature is more than sufficient. Especially in the last two decades so many fossils of the bones of early man have been found that an unbroken chain can be established going back more than a million years. The older these remains are the more the appearance of man gives way to the form of an ape.

Reliable research showed that the process of human development began over a million years ago, and in any case not later than seven hundred thousand years ago.

Whenever human development began, it is a fact that 400,000 years ago man was already very like he is today in outward appearance. That means that in biological terms this unique development from ape to man took place in an exceptionally short time, and no satisfactory explanation for this has yet been given. More important than the question when human development began are the questions why and how this process took place.

A further question is: where are the fossilized bones of those apes from which man later developed? It is true that a fair number of ape remains have been found in which the process of human development can already be recognized; but no remains have been found of any apes of which man can say with certainty that these are the forbears of later man.

The majority of bone fossils belonging to creatures already manifesting human traits and producing tools were found in South East Africa, principally in the Olduvai Gorge. Later on, they found in this same place fossils of the *same breeds* but with the skulls, bone structure, jaws and teeth showing small divergencies: the fossils of apes which had not yet started on the process of human development, that is to say they did not use tools.

With seeming logic it was concluded that these apes had lived some hundreds of thousands of years earlier and that they were the primitive ancestors of the tool-producing ape-man.

Great was the astonishment when it had to be admitted in the face of unequivocal proof that both the tool-making creatures and their non-tool-producing supposed ancestors lived not only in the same place, but at the same time.

This flatly contradicts the theory of natural evolution. For if for some natural reason a breed of ape became embarked upon a process of development leading towards man, then all members of that breed who lived at the same time in the same geographical place would have to undergo the same process. It is not consistent with natural evolution that a section of the breed should suddenly begin a rocket-like ascent towards human development, become clever and produce tools, while the remaining section living at the same time in the same place remains ape and does no more than look on in astonishment.

Strange to tell, the apes which did not produce tools disappeared without trace while the others continued to further their development. Did the former die out because they were not clever enough to keep themselves alive? Does that mean you have to become human to avoid extinction? Then how is it that other breeds of ape, chimpanzees, gorillas and orang-outangs among them, have not become extinct?

Then there were other similar complications which made the situation even more confusing. In South East Asia the fossilized bones of another breed of ape have been found, especially on the island of Java, and this breed also shows the characteristics of human development and they too produced tools.

Here too remains of a type of ape very similar to the tool-producing ape were found. They produced no tools so that it was supposed here also that these were the forbears of the tool-making ape.

But it was shown in this case as well that both the tool-producing ape-men and their supposed forbears had lived at the same time and in the same place. Here too those as yet unable to produce tools disappeared without trace in a surprisingly short space of time.

In other words the riddle confronting people in Africa was repeated in South East Asia.

And what is even stranger: the African and Javanese hominids were not of the same breed, and between the two groups there is the Indian Ocean which extends many thousands of miles.

Was it to be taken that the wonder whereby man came into being, the causes for which have not been explained up to now, took place twice? At the same time and at two widely separated points on the earth's surface? And even among two breeds of ape which were not related to one another?

How could it be that both these so different breeds developed into *Homo sapiens* independently of each other and yet along parallel lines and in the same direction?

And above all: how could it be that in both areas both breeds of hominid ape were divided into two groups inhabiting the same territory, with one half still living unequivocally as apes, while the other had already set out on the path leading to human development and were producing tools?

Scholars cannot explain all these strange phenomena. Because all this is inconsistent with natural development which they want to prove at all costs, they keep quiet about it. Against this, scrupulously exact measurements of bones and teeth are carried out and the tiniest details are gone into with the greatest enthusiasm; but the decisive phenomena were always left out of account if they were not in accordance with natural development and did not therefore fit into the prefabricated concept.

The most decisive question concerning development from ape to man is: what were the causes which set the process of human development in motion, and why did these not operate on all other anthropoid great apes living at the same time in the same territories as the ape forbears of man?

The evolutionary history of all breeds of hominoid ape is known to us through finds going back about twenty million years. We know that they were very similar in form and in their way of life, and developed slowly in the course of millions of

years within the framework of natural evolution, without any one of these breeds making dramatic progress.

Apart from that, we also know that about a million years ago all breeds of hominoid ape had roughly the same skull capacity—about 400–500 c.c. There was no super-race among them with special abilities. The intelligence level of all of them was approximately the same and was sufficient to allow them to fulfil the conditions basic to continued healthy existence.

All hominoid apes still in existence today, chimpanzees, gorillas and orang-outangs, have remained at nearly the same stage of development as a million years ago. They altered within the bounds of natural development just as slowly as they had in the preceding twenty million years. Over a million years the capacity of their skulls grew by only about five per cent, and their intelligence too presumably rose only proportionately.

There was only one unexplained exception: a million years ago one type of hominoid ape the identity of which has not yet been ascertained started on a steep upward climb. The brain and intelligence of these apes grew with a speed which is unique and unparalleled in the whole history of Nature. While the brain of this breed grew from about 400 c.c. to an average of 1400 c.c.—i.e. by 350 per cent—over the last million years, intelligence and memory increased a hundredfold or even a thousandfold. And this enormous difference between brain growth and increase in intelligence is also an occurrence unique in Nature and contrary to all rules governing natural evolution. This is rightly regarded as a puzzling phenomenon of Nature, and understandably man tries to explain this marvel which befell none other than himself.

Equally understandably he tries to present this development as natural. If he succeeds, then he can explain not only his beginnings but also his actions and goals as being in accordance with Nature: i.e., at one with divine order. He could by the same token put an end to his growing doubts concerning the rightness of his own endeavours which he calls progress.

Even scholars and scientists try at all costs to present this singular phenomenon as a natural development, acting therein more under pressure from the subconscious than consciously speculating without preconception. This tendency is supported by the church's theologians. They are trying desperately to fuse

the theory of natural evolution from ape to man with religious dogmas in such a way as to leave untouched a divine will, and with it a special place for man.

Scholars and churches are, moreover, supported in their efforts by so-called officialdom and can proclaim the most utter nonsense without contradiction as long as their pearls of wisdom, spiced with incomprehensible foreign words, sound 'scientific' and argue in favour of natural evolution.

Under these influences the commonly accepted theory concerning the origin of man, which is as popular as it is naïve, came into being.

According to this the forbears of man were hominid apes. They lived in the forest where their closest relatives, anthropoid apes, still in existence today, lived and still do live. Through an alteration in climate the forest disappeared and turned into prairie. In this new environment our ancestors were exposed to many new dangers which they were unable to cope with. Animals of prey lurked in the tall grass, but more important still, their daily food was concealed by the upsurge of grass. This circumstance compelled them to get up on their hind legs and walk upright. Thus they could see their enemies better and find their food more easily in the grasslands. And they were able to run faster like this too if they were being chased by wild animals or if they themselves were hunting animals.

Only after they had learnt to walk and stand on their hind legs did their hands become free. This allowed them to take things in their hands and examine and observe them, and so manipulate them; they acquired the ability to think abstractly and began to shape things to serve their purposes. Thus they made the first primitive tools and weapons and so became superior to the animals. They became hunters and were able to *feed better* and use animal skins to clothe themselves. The use of weapons and tools gave them further ideas and inspirations and increased their thinking capacity, and they were able to produce increasingly complicated objects. Along with their intelligence their feeling of social duty grew, and caused the gradual formation of the closed family. They were continually forced to solve new problems by the constantly changing and rising demands which were being created at any given time by their *improved* way of life. This again furthered the intelligence and led to new inventions.

This process has supposedly run its course as a sort of chain reaction which is the stuff of real progress.

Added to this there were the usual evolutionary factors, such as natural selection and adaptation to the demands of the environment, and they were continually making man cleverer, healthier, more morally responsible and better.

This so 'scientifically' and subtly reasoned process was supposed to show that an ape turned into *Homo sapiens*, a mentally and physically healthy creature highly developed morally: *Homo sapiens* who can annihilate his fellow men with atom bombs and shoots at heavenly bodies with rockets.

This theory is a collection of contradictions which it is easier to refute than to invent. It is certainly simpler to believe that God who suddenly conjured up the universe and all other living creatures by one simple command had to knead man out of the earth with his own hands because his outstanding skills had already been exhausted.

It is certain that man's ape forbears lived in the forest, not alone however, but with all similar anthropoid apes which still live there today.

If the forest disappeared because of the climate, then it did not disappear only for those apes which were later to become man, but for all the others too. But then all apes, chimpanzees, gorillas and orang-outangs too would find themselves on grassy plains. If one breed of ape was driven by fear of wild animals and in order to find food more easily to get up on its hind legs, why did the other apes not get on to their hind legs too for the same reasons? Was only one single breed so fearful or so clever?

If walking upright was a means of movement crucial to continued existence and the preservation of life and it was not acquired by the other apes, why were these not exterminated by wild animals, why did they not die of hunger, as their food too was presumably hidden by the tall grass?

And what kind of grass is it that these 'scientists' have planted here? Grass which was exactly at the eye level of a hominid ape standing upright? Hominid apes varied from over three feet to over five feet in height. This ideal grass would then have to match the eye level whatever it happened to be, as there would otherwise have been no sense in walking upright.

Anyone who has ever seen a prairie knows that such a miracle prairie exists only in the imagination of some scholars.

According to this theory, moreover, all forests must have dried up, as otherwise the apes would have retreated into the remaining forestland, and the theory of natural evolution could have been taken no further. In fact, during the last million years there have been several alternations between rainy and dry periods, but never did all forests dry up. Even in the driest period there was more forestland on the earth than grassland, and all apes would have been able to withdraw to the remaining forests to pursue their accustomed way of life there.

Why did all other great apes do this, but for those from which man is said to have later developed?

Did one breed of ape prefer to live on barren grassland during the alleged dry period so that they might feed there among increased dangers? Or was it that the future *Homo sapiens* was not clever enough to withdraw into the remaining forests? Was then stupidity itself the point of departure for human development?

Or has life on grassland advantages which attracted one breed of ape onto the prairies? Why then did the other great apes not profit from them? Or did dangers suddenly arise in the forest which caused some apes to flee from it, because they would not have been able to survive otherwise? How then did the other apes which did not give up living in the forest remain in existence?

Many scholars affirm too that man was able to run faster because he went upright. Those who maintain that should be pursued some time by an angry gorilla. They would have to rewrite their books on the basis of their experiences.

And they keep quiet about the fact that man in walking upright lost his ability to climb trees. If he learnt how to walk upright because he was afraid of wild animals, then he acquired a wrong skill and unlearnt one which he needed badly. For today he still laboriously climbs a tree when confronted with a wild boar, a rhinoceros or a lion, and he would give a lot to be able to do so better and more quickly. If he lost this ability at the very time he most needed it, then that is not natural development, or progress, but a loss. But even this loss had to be explained as progress so that the theory of natural evolution fits.

Right from the very start the official theory of evolution is completely untenable. For this theory based on wishful thinking scholars had to invent an ideal dry period and miracle grasslands. They had also to design an ape which did not find its way to the remaining forests and needed to find a stone in the tall grass so that it could, in spite of its vegetarian way of life, kill a zebra with the axe it made out of it. By a monstrous feat of imagination they also succeeded in sending all apes which were destined to remain apes into the woods.

And what connection is there supposed to be between free hands and increased intelligence?

We know that hominoid apes were predominantly forest animals and that they all, including man's forbears, had hands with which they could grasp and manipulate things. We know too that they spent at least seventy per cent of their time in a sitting position, just as they do today, and when they did they were free to use their hands. No single ape needed to stand up on its hind legs to be able to pick up objects in its hands. Quite the opposite: when apes stand up they generally have to support themselves on their arms and are unable to hold anything in their hands. We know too that apes are curious animals and pick up and look at many objects, almost always in a sitting position. Their manual dexterity is so great that they can even catch fleas and kill them, and if they possessed the necessary intelligence they could all become watchmakers. You do not need to go to a university to learn this, you need only visit a zoo for an hour. It costs less too.

In spite of these completely free and dextrous hands not a single breed of ape had been stimulated in the course of the previous twenty million years to produce even the most primitive tool. So if free hands were supposed to cause cleverness and lead to tool production, why did this possibility lie dormant in all breeds of ape for twenty million years? And why is it still dormant in present-day great apes even though they have free hands?

Why should this effect of having free hands have come into play only about one million years ago and only in the case of one single breed—that which later developed into man? Why not among the other great apes as well? One million years ago they had just as big a brain as the forbears of man then possessed.

Why did they not at least copy what they saw their relations doing?

Is it perhaps because free hands alone are not sufficient for the acquisition of special thinking ability: is it also necessary to walk upright?

No, that will not do either. If an ape or a man has to carry out any mental work using a concentrated thought process, he tries if possible to do this in a sitting position because concentrated thought is considerably easier then than when walking or standing.

For both activities use energy and this curtails the energy supply of the body and of the brain too; and this impedes thought.

Most of man's ideas, especially the more important among them, came into being while he was sitting or lying down.

Gibbons are also members of the hominoid ape species. They sit a great deal, and what is more when they walk, they walk in an upright position, with their hands completely free. And yet their intellectual abilities have progressed no further than those of the gorilla, which has to support itself when walking with its clenched hand. Quite the contrary. They were and remain on the lowest level of intelligence found among anthropoid apes.

Hence it follows that having free hands, walking upright, even the two together, do not lead to an increase in intelligence. Any such claim is a complete fabrication.

What do the scholars say about hunting and eating meat? All hominoid apes were and are basically vegetarian; a few types of ape—mostly not anthropoid—occasionally eat worms, mice and other small animals. Man's forbears were vegetarian too, and became carnivorous only in the course of the process of human development. This happened about one million years ago, and what is more it happened overnight, so to speak, without a long transitional period.

Science regards this as a natural development and flesh-eating is supposed to have been a sign of increased intelligence and even progress, because man was able with meat to have a 'lighter' and 'better' diet.

Wolves and wild cats give thanks for this compliment as they were already carnivorous many millions of years earlier.

What is supposed to be meant by saying that the vegetarian

half-man or half-ape by going over to eating meat could have a 'better' diet? Perhaps he was underfed before? But then on the same diet all other apes are not, and still are not right up to the present day, though they remained vegetarians. Why did they not die out a long time ago? Why are they a hundred times healthier than any race of men—unless they are living in a zoo? Or perhaps all animals that live as vegetarians are eating the wrong food simply because they are not intelligent enough to start eating meat? Does higher intelligence perforce bring flesh-eating in its train? What level of intelligence would animals have to reach in the course of natural development for this to happen? When will cows start to bite and when will elephants start eating meat?

And why did it suddenly become easier for man's ancestors to feed themselves on meat? Since when has it been easier to kill a gazelle or a bison than to pick a piece of fruit from a tree?

It is quite certain that all vegetarian breeds of animal were always able to solve their feeding problems without having to turn into beasts of prey. Were man's ancestors not clever enough to do this? Then the change-over to flesh-eating resulted not from cleverness but from stupidity. How is it then that the very dumbest apes have become men? Why then is the change-over to flesh-eating said to have been a sign of higher intelligence?

There were never compelling reasons for a breed of herbivorous apes to change over to being carnivorous, as some scientists maintain; on this earth the supply of plants has always been greater than the supply of animals, and there have always been more herbivorous animals on the earth than carnivorous ones. If it were otherwise, there would certainly have been no animals left on earth long ago.

Today the earth has a population of three thousand million people, and even they could still follow a completely vegetarian diet, although there is much less vegetation left nowadays than in earlier times. Several hundreds of millions of people do still today live as vegetarians. Not, however, because they are not intelligent enough or can find no meat, but because they have recognized a vegetarian diet as man's original one which is in many ways beneficial.

The change-over from eating plants to eating animals took

place at the earliest stage of man's development and in a very short space of time, overnight so to speak. This is an absolutely unnatural occurrence; it can have nothing to do either with natural evolution or with increased intelligence.

All the theories mentioned are riddled with contradictions, and under the cloak of a dubious specialist language they were offered for acceptance to a public that hungers for confirmation of man's divine mission which it increasingly doubts.

If previously current theories are not correct, what is the truth?

If instead of always looking for points of resemblance between ape and man researchers had paid more attention to the most striking differences between them, they would probably have got further. Instead of this they were always pleased when they found something more which men and apes have in common.

The most revealing physical and mental differences are these: anthropoid apes have a thick coat of hair, while man lost his in the process of turning into man. He was forced by this to use artificial clothing as a substitute, because otherwise he would have become extinct.

Female mammals, including anthropoid apes, are so made that their time of ovulation and fertility can be recognized. During this oestrus period the female sex organ is discoloured and enlarged and secretes a fluid which gives off a scent. The male animal mates with the female only when excited by these signs. The female ancestors of man also possessed these sex signs. They were lost, however, during the process of human development. The human male and female can become sexually excited and have intercourse even when the signs mentioned above are not present.

Anthropoid apes were and are sufficiently intelligent to carry out all tasks necessary for continued existence. Man's ape forbears too possessed sufficient intelligence for this. Yet man's intelligence has increased enormously in the last million years, although man's forbears were no more presented with new tasks by Nature than any other breed of ape. The vast increase in intelligence of this species occurred, therefore, without reason, in contradiction to what is natural, and without being necessary for healthy continued existence. On the contrary, it was the cause of disharmony between man's physical and mental needs

and aspirations, and made him lose his natural equilibrium between mind and body. This is not a development tending towards perfection; it does not lead to a state of happiness and therefore cannot be in harmony with cosmic order.

No one disputes the fact that man's ancestors had a coat of hair. Before birth every human embryo is covered with hair which disappears either before or shortly after birth. What is left after that is a thin, degenerate growth incapable of fulfilling the functions of a full coat of hair. In a few exceptional cases human beings do have a good thick covering of hair over all or part of the body which does not disappear. A reappearance of ancestral characteristics which have disappeared in the course of evolution is called atavism or a throwback. In this case that atavism is the surest proof that man's forbears were hairy animals.

What functions has a coat of hair?

It protects against cold, and also against the strong rays of the sun and against heat. It helps to maintain the body temperature at approximately 36° C, for energy is consumed both in generating warmth and in cooling down.

The coat of hair isolates the body from the outside world and ensures that it is not exposed to extreme variations of temperature. This preserves energy which can then be used for other physiological functions and to fight bacteria which cause illness. This is one of the reasons why animals are more resistant to illness than man.

If a man goes into a draught with a naked, sweating body, he becomes ill, and his doctor calls this illness a cold. When this happens, the body has expended too much energy in a short period of time in replacing the lost heat. The supply of energy thus depleted is not sufficient to stand up to the bacteria in the body. And these bacteria make man ill, not cold. A naked man can however become ill in exactly the same way if he exposes himself too long to the rays of a strong sun. His body in this case will expend too much energy reducing the high temperature outside and here again there is the danger that bacteria may attack his inside organs.

Body hair moreover allows the moisture secreted by the pores of the skin to evaporate only at a slow rate. Quick evaporation would lead to rapid cooling down, the body in turn would

suddenly have to expend too much energy in generating warmth, and the depleted supply of energy would not be sufficient to carry out other physiological functions. The skin of a human being secretes between two and eight pints of fluid a day, which should evaporate at such a rate that body temperature and skin moisture are at the biologically required level. But this function could be performed only by a complete covering of body hair. No artificial clothing in the world is capable of it.

A coat of hair is at the same time the best clothing because it allows full freedom of movement and does not in any way restrict blood circulation. This too is an important precondition for maintaining physical and mental health. Restricted circulation is a strain on the heart and impedes the supply of blood to the body, including the brain. This is the cause of many illnesses, even if they are mainly diagnosed differently.

Tight constricting clothing reduces one's ability to think to an undreamt-of degree, and gives rise to unwelcome states of mind, and to irritability, impatience and aggressiveness. Anyone wearing tight shoes is clearly aware of this.

Moreover, a coat of one's own protects against scrapes and blows. It does not get worn out and renews itself. Of the hairs that have finished growing only as many fall out as is necessary for the coat to remain sufficiently long. The length and thickness of the coat even regulate themselves according to changing climatic conditions, in the course of the year.

Artificial clothing tears, wears out, gets dirty and must therefore be washed and changed.

One of the most important yet least considered functions of the coat consists of the automatic cleaning of the skin and of the coat itself. Sweat loosens dirt adhering to the skin which then literally climbs up the individual hairs. At the ends of the hairs it dries and falls off as dust. Any ape living in freedom will always be found to have an exceptionally clean, healthy and odourless skin, although he never has a bath.

Man on the other hand without artificial hygiene is unclean and foul-smelling. Sweat and dirt remain adhering to his skin and decay there. He is forced to wash often. If he did not, not only would he smell unpleasant, but he would suffer from a great variety of skin diseases. And in spite of his cleanliness he is not

as clean as an ape living in liberty, although he has been using pleasant-smelling substances since time immemorial to efface or conceal his foul-smelling sweat and the dirt on his skin.

Artificial clothing does not clean the skin. On the contrary, sweat is mainly retained on the skin by clothing, or it sticks to the clothing where it decomposes and irritates the skin.

Body hair affords visual camouflage too by means of its colour—an added safeguard against the attacks of hostile animals. This camouflage was of the greatest importance at the very time when man lost his hair. But even today he wears camouflaging clothing when hunting animals or when, under the influence of a periodically recurring morbid mass psychosis, engaged on planned group mass-murder expeditions against his fellow men: which he calls wars. Body hair likewise protects one from the rain. The water slides outwards off the grease-covered hairs or evaporates in the warm air-cushion formed by the hair. Artificial clothing can admittedly be waterproof too; but then it is also air-proof, and so harmful to the health.

A coat of hair of one's own is thus a perfect, unsurpassable form of clothing, which contributes extensively to one's health. Man lost his, and has to replace it artificially. The substitute is however not only imperfect; it actually causes physical and mental damage.

This loss took place very early, while man was still half-animal, when his intellectual capacity was still not equal to procuring substitute clothing. It happened at a stage in time when he was supposedly exiled to grasslands, where as is well-known biting winds blow, nights are cold, and he would need camouflage from wild animals.

Man has never been able to eliminate the harmful effects which artificial clothing has on his health. His first clothing still remains the best substitute: he used vegetable materials and the hides of animals and produced from these very wide loose-fitting clothing. This restricted his movements as little as possible and provided amply for air circulation between skin and clothing, which controlled body heat and the evaporation of sweat relatively well.

As a result of his increasing mental decline man's works became in the course of time more important for him than himself. So in his clothing too he stressed externals at the expense of

fitness for purpose, health and comfort, thereby causing undreamt-of physical and mental damage.

Thus the loss of his coat of body hair had only disadvantages for man, and no advantages; in the end he was forced to replace as best he could what he had lost, because he would otherwise have become extinct.

All this, however, did not prevent the scientists from representing this diseased deficiency as a logical consequence of natural evolution, without pointing out even one single advantage.

Some 'scientists' even consider it possible that loss of body hair was caused by 'mechanisms of sexual selection'. According to this theory the ideal of beauty for a male ape suddenly became a naked she-ape, and only such females were fertilized.

As if that were not enough, some even maintain quite seriously that this state of affairs contributed greatly to raising intelligence because producing clothes furthers the intelligence and means progress.

According to this tailor-favouring theory it is downright fortunate that man lost something useful to him, which he had to replace by the sweat of his brow. This appears in 'scientific' books written by 'scientists' and is unprotestingly read and believed by the 'enlightened' public.

A similar loss affecting any other animal, even in a much milder form, would be represented by the same scientists as aberrant and entirely incompatible with natural development. However, as this loss concerned man, they feel bound to stand the truth on its head.

And what reasons do the scientists produce to account for the loss of a coat of hair? One of the theories runs thus: primitive man did not need hair on his body either in the tropics or in colder regions and shed it in a natural way. Whether this was achieved by growing intelligence is not stated, but connections are implied. In any case this is supposed to have been a step forward as far as natural evolution is concerned. Why man had to find clothing for himself from the earliest times is mentioned by no one, because one would then have to recognize that the coming of nakedness was an aberrant development and a disease. That would discredit all books about the evolution of mankind.

At the same time it is still maintained that man's forbears

were afraid of animals and because of this stood up on their hind legs in the high grass to be able to see their enemies. Logically they would have needed good camouflage for this, but they lost this at that very time.

Others concern themselves less with causes and come to the following conclusion:

In his state of half-man, man began to wear clothes and this caused his own coat of hair to become superfluous, and it degenerated and disappeared.

Why a half-animal/half-man suddenly puts on clothes, although he has a coat of hair, no one wants to explain at any price. His own coat had given this creature sufficient protection for twenty million years.

This theory also represents artificial clothing as a sign of progress, demonstrating things, it is true, the other way round. *One minute cleverness makes you naked, the next nakedness makes you clever.*

But there are still other theories in circulation concerning the loss of body hair: man lost his coat of hair through natural selection. Body hair caused wind-resistance when running. As man was always having to run away from or run after wild animals, only those who had least hair survived, since they could run faster because they encountered less wind-resistance. This process of natural selection continued until all men were naked. Where they hid their hair-covered heads as they ran the scientists do not say. Thus man was supposed to turn into a sort of streamlined racing vehicle superior to hairy animals as far as running is concerned. To be sure, this was not a success, for wolves and tigers were faster in spite of their hair. And yet he, the loser, is to be portrayed as the victor.

Where natural evolution is concerned it is not possible that the loss of body hair should have anything to do with the growth of intelligence. Nor can an increase in intelligence cause the loss of body hair.

Man could be just as clever with a coat of hair as he is naked, perhaps even cleverer; and would certainly be healthier than he is today.

The second great loss suffered during the process of human development was the disappearance of sex signs in the female. These appear once a month in anthropoid apes and last only a

few days. The male animal should expend his sexual energy only at times when fertilization is possible. Otherwise continual strife would reign among the males of a group concerning the female apes, with an endless round of chaotic and pointless sexual activity.

This would cause the ever necessary vigilance towards the hostile environment to suffer, and there would be insufficient time and strength even for the gathering of food. Any species of animal would eventually die out in such circumstances.

Now, did the hominid ape which later became man have this important mechanism for preserving the breed's healthy continued existence? Yes, it did. Otherwise the species would long since have become extinct in its ape condition, for the aforesaid reasons. In some primitive tribes on islands in the Pacific Ocean, who embarked on the process of human development several hundred thousand years later, many women still possess degenerate traces of these sex signs, which occur still oftener as atavistic throwbacks.

Man lost this extremely important physiological characteristic in the course of human development; this loss may in the very near future decide whether he survives or not. If the signs of fertility still existed he would be able to prevent the overpopulation of the earth by natural birth-control.

This loss too hit human beings hard. As man's drive towards sexual activity did not lessen, he at first had intercourse indiscriminately at any time with any woman, even if she were not showing signs of sexual readiness. This was before long the cause of an increase in sexual activity regardless of its purpose, and of continual deadly strife among men. This period became one of the most dangerous in the history of mankind, for the species was threatened with extinction, or self-annihilation.

However, as man already possessed a greater capacity for thought by that time, he was able to save his breed from extinction by an ingenious stratagem: one or more women were allotted to each man for his exclusive use, and at the same time he was forbidden to associate with other women on a sexual basis. From this was born the institution of marriage, which is today just as imperfect an expedient as it was then. From the beginning it has been a completely unnatural, but inevitably necessary measure.

The polygamous ape, which previously had been able to associate freely with all the females of his group manifesting the signs of fertility, put a chain round his own neck. Infringement of the rule was punished harshly, often by death, as it still is in many societies.

Is it possible that in the course of natural evolution this vital physiological function should have disappeared and have had to be meagrely replaced by an artificial arrangement, to avoid the extinction of the species?

No, nor can this have anything to do with natural development.

Now, is this loss of such an important attribute of the sexual life a prerequisite for the acquisition of higher intelligence?

Or, does higher intelligence cause the loss of such an important physiological attribute?

The acquisition of higher intelligence in the course of natural evolution cannot be connected with the loss of meaningful physical characteristics. Nor can the loss of an important physiological attribute be the precondition for an increase in intelligence.

Thus this loss too has nothing to do with natural development, higher intelligence and progress; more, it is unnatural and damaging.

All this, however, does not prevent the 'scientists' from once again representing this defect, though it took coercion to put it right, as a product of natural development, and the expedient of marriage as a sign of high intelligence. Science simply refuses to recognize that man even today accepts these rules only with reluctance, in spite of their needfulness, and therefore draws no conclusions from this.

Man is constantly in rebellion against these self-imposed rules. He changes wives and maintains brothels. If the rules circumscribing him were the consequence of natural development and increased intelligence and man rebelled against them, then he would be rebelling against his own development and his own intelligence.

However, no creature on earth is in opposition to its own natural development or the consequences of it. So if man did establish something against which he periodically rebels, this happened not because he was more intelligent but because he

was forced into it by necessity, brought about by an unnatural cause.

Man's sexual life is transparently in a mess. Far from indicating natural development, this can only indicate unnatural development, the consequences of which man has not yet grasped even today; indeed, he has not the remotest idea of them.

The third phenomenon is the immense and rapid growth of the brain and the still greater increase of the intelligence.

Basically each creature is provided only with such attributes and abilities as are necessary for preservation of self and breed. This is true of physical attributes just as much as of mental abilities.

If a breed does not fulfil these basic conditions it becomes extinct. Man's forbears like their nearest relations, other hominoid apes, began by fulfilling these basic conditions for a healthy life. They had more or less the same skull capacity and possessed equal intelligence. They lived at the same time in the same geographical territories in the same climatic conditions. They ate the same food: fruit, plants and roots. They were almost indistinguishable in their way of life. They even had the same enemies.

Then what did the animal that later became man need higher intelligence for? Was this increase in intelligence necessary for the preservation of the species? Would they have died out if their intelligence had not increased? Did Nature make special new demands of them which only a higher intelligence could meet?

Nature—as has been said—did not make any such new demands of them. Had it been so, then all other hominoid apes would have been similarly affected, and their intelligence too would have risen accordingly. But they underwent no such phenomenal increase in intelligence, and in spite of that they did not become extinct; instead, they are still living today in better health and with fewer worries than man. Man, however, in the last million years acquired an excess of intellectual ability which he does not need to keep himself alive; not only this, he finds it a source of ever new and ever greater worries and problems, which up until now he has been unable to overcome. On the contrary, he makes problems for himself that are more and more numerous and more and more difficult, in solving which he conjures up even more complicated problems. He cannot escape this

fiendish spiral. Strangely enough, this increase in intelligence began at the same time as he lost the other two vital attributes: his coat of hair and the female sex signals.

The laws of natural evolution teach not only that no creature loses useful attributes, but also that none acquires abilities not needed in fulfilling the essential conditions of life.

The exceptional increase in brain size and intelligence shows clearly, however, that a surplus was created in this case.

So natural development cannot result in a surplus of intelligence. If such a surplus occurred and further abnormal physical defects appeared into the bargain, this could only happen as a result of artificial intervention.

There are already three indications to be considered which suggest something other than natural evolution: the loss of a coat of body hair, the loss of the sex signs and the surplus of intelligence. Deficiency and excess are diseased conditions.

No creature on earth would be able to sustain two such serious physical losses—one of which alone would be sufficient to destroy the species—unless some artificial measures were used to counteract them.

The self-same creature however possesses a surplus of brain and intelligence which makes it possible for him to correct in a makeshift sort of way the two diseased deficiencies.

Only one such being exists on earth, and that is man. He is the youngest living creature, and since he acquired his new consciousness he has asked in fear, confusion and doubt the questions: Where do we come from? What are we? Where are we going?

These questions were and are fully justified. For man feels that in his case the balance between mind and body has been lost. He sought and still seeks today the truth concerning himself, and he searches for what he has lost, although he does not know what it is and why he has lost it.

If one works on these assumptions all illusions concerning man, his origin and the goals he has followed hitherto disappear. His imaginatively constructed castle in the air has collapsed; the ground is being cut away beneath the feet of the affirmations which have always been believed, for man came into being not in harmony with the principles of this universe, but in acting against its order and making himself. He became physically and

mentally sick. He is swimming in a raging ocean of uncertainty the billows of which he himself has caused to rage. The lifeboats which he is forever constructing in the name of progress are puny straws to which he tightly clings, but they are not able to carry him. And one day not even a straw will be left, there will be no lifeboat for him.

3. The Empty Skulls

ONE APE DISCOVERED THAT EATING THE FRESH BRAIN OF ONE'S OWN KIND INCREASES THE SEXUAL IMPULSES. HE AND HIS DESCENDANTS BECAME ADDICTED TO BRAINS AND HUNTED FOR THEM. IT WAS NOT UNTIL LATER THAT THEY NOTICED THAT THEIR INTELLIGENCE INCREASED AS A RESULT. THE OUTCOME OF THIS PROCESS IS *HOMO SAPIENS*.

The description 'central nervous system' is used to describe the brain itself and the network of nerves which is attached to the brain. The brain performs many functions, and does not serve exclusively for thinking.

Man knows very little about the functioning of the brain. He knows the various parts which perform different functions. He knows that the brain controls not only conscious voluntary actions, but also unconscious automatic ones, like digestion, growth, gland secretions, blood formation and everything required to maintain life.

These functions are so stratified that it will still be a long time before man is able to explain them even approximately. Even the origin of a thought and memory itself are and remain unexplored phenomena. To understand the process of thought by what is itself a thought process is just as impossible as to lift oneself up in the air.

But it is certain that chemical substances react upon one another in the brain in a way which is inexplicable. This gives rise to impulses and orders which are intended to regulate living functions harmoniously. What these impulses and orders are we cannot say. Their origin and how they take effect are unknown to us.

All the physical and intellectual functions of every animal are harmoniously guided by the brain so that neither deficiency nor excess occurs in the organs.